टेकेन अप दिस स्कीम। और दूसरे स्टेट्स ने अभी इस को स्वीकार नहीं किया है। जब वे इस को स्वीकार कर लेंगे तो इस को वहां लागू किया जायगा । और आज तक उन को कितना पैसा दिया गया इस के फीगर्स तो मेरे पास नहीं हैं, लेकिन कंपेंसेशन गवर्नमेंट नहीं देती है । गवर्नमेंट तो किसानों को मदद करती है ।

SHRI RAOOF VALIULLAH: I would like to refer to part (c) of the answer. According Io Ihe Eighth Finance Commission's recommendations, central assistance to the Sta is in tlie form of 50 pei cent grant and 50 per cent loan. *Lvt* for calamities of rare severity, the norms of assistance could be changed. Will the Minister be pleased [to] assur$_e$ this House that in drought situations of rare severity, the pattern of assistance to be provided will be on the basis of 75 per cent grant afld 25 per cent loan, or at least will the proposal put forward by the Government of Gujarat be considered?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, according to th$_e$ F.ighth Finance Commission, the procedure is that relief assistance is given as advance against Plan assistance and that can be made up within a period of 5 year$_s$ and that is upto 5 per cent of the Annual Plan. If it exceeds 5 per cent of the Annual Plan, th«>n 50 per cent is released as grant and 50 per cent as loan.

So far as rare severity is concerned, that is there in the Eighth Finance Commission and we are considering the cases of one or two States where there is severe drought and the drought has been there since the last three or four years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question. Mr. Goyal.

Reported Irregularities in Nafed Audit Report

•144. SHRI J. P. GOYAL: j
SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state;

(a) whether Government's atten tion has been drawn to a news item appearing in Indian Expres$_s$ on the 19th April, 1986 in which it is stated that the recent audit report of the National Agricultural Cooperative Marketing Federation of India (NAFED) presented to Government has exposed a multi-crore scand involving large scal$_e$ rnisappropriai of fund$_s$ in the form of business losses, manipulation of accounts; financial irregularities and management Of affairs in gross violation of rules and cooperative principles;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof:

(c) what are the particulars $_0$I persons involved in the said mul-'.-crore scandal; and

(d) what action has so far been taken or proposed to be taken against them by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI BUTA SINGH): (a) and (b) There were some reports tn, the Press on 19th and 20th Apol, 1986 alleging financial mismanagement and losses in the working of NAFED, as revealed in its audit report for 1983-84. NAFED's clarifications refuting the allegations wer$_e$ published in the same papers on 22nd and 23rd April, 1986.

†The question wa$_s$ actually asked on the floor of the House by £>hi¯i J. P. Goyal.

(c) and(d) The Central Registrar of Coopreative Societies had called Ior the comments of NAFED on the various observations of the auditors for taking further action as may be considered necessary. The Board of Directors of NAFED have referred the audit report for detailed examination by their Finance & Accounts Sub-Committee.

SHRI J. P. GOYAL: Sir, in my submission the answer no> parts (a) to (d) has not been properly given. It has been stated while; replying to (a) and (b) that the explanation of NAFED has been published in the newpapers of 22nd and 23rd April, 1986, whereas I have just called for-the Indian Express of 22nd and 23rd April, 1986. and I do not find refernce to any such clarification by the NAFED. Moreover, in the question itself I made a reference to the reports in the Indian Express dated 19th April and in the Indian Express of 22nd and 23rd April, there is nothing.

SHRI PAREVATHANENl UPENDRA : They have given a clarification.

SHRI J. P. GOYAL: Where? In the Indian Express?

SHRI YOGENDEA MAKWANA: Yes, I have got a photostat copy.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Anyway, the Mmister will have the cutting.

SHRI J. P. GOYAL- Sir. various details of malpractices by the NAFED have been given in the Indian Express of 19th and 20th and it is a lamentable state of affairs. It shows that huge losses have been incurred by NAFED whereas thr. purpose 0I the formation of NAFED was to abolish the middleman and to get proper prices to the farmer and to get foreign .exchange to the country. Hei'e it appears that the officers concerned who are at the helm of affairs have mad? their own money at the cost of the country. In the second part of the answer he says that the Board of Directors of NAFED have' referred the audit report for detailed examination by their Finance and Accounts Sub-Committee. That will not serve the purpose because the *Indian Express*....

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question? Your time—two minutes is up. Therefore, put the question immediately

SHRI J. P. GOYAL: This will not do because the press report says it is probably for fear of exposure by the audit report that the Finance Accounts Sub-Committee and the Board of Directors had passed a resolution in February last year that the audit report should not be placed before Parliament, without assigning any reason. So the audit report, by a resolution, has been forbidden to be placed before Parliament. So I would request the honourable Minister to place it before Parliament because serious allegations have been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: That we are placing. There is a certain set procedure and under law we have to place it. But the clarification is given in the same newspapers the *Financial Express* as well as the *Indian Express*. If the honourable Member goes through it he will find answers to all the questions in his mind. If he has not got that paper, I can supply it to him.

SHRI J. P. GOYAL: Now what action do you propose to take against the officers concerned as asked in part (d) of the question?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: The question does not arise unless somebody is found guilty. Unless we prove an officer is guilty we cannot say we are going to take action. I can assure the honourable Member that if there is some fraud, mischief or mistake on the part of the officers, then we shall certainly take action against them.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : श्रीमन्, माननीय मंत्री जी मुझ से सहमत होंगे कि कोआपरेटिव संस्थाओं, जिनमें नेफेड भी है, का गठन उपभोक्ताओं और उत्पादकों के मुनाफे को जो मिडिलमैन खाता था, उनको समाप्त करने के लिए हुआ था। क्या माननीय मंत्री जी को यह जानकारी है कि नेफेड अपने मुख्य ट्रांजेक्शंस कांट्रेक्टर्स और ब्रोकर्स के माध्यम से या कमीशन एजेंट्स के जरिये करा रहा है । क्या आपको इसकी जानकारी है? अगर है तो आपने इसको क्यों नहीं रोका? अगर जानकारी नहीं है तो क्या इसको रोकने की कोशिश करेंगे?

दूसरा प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि सन 1983-84 की जो ऐन्युअल रिपोर्ट संसद में 9 महीने के अंदर रखी जानी चाहिए थी, उसको पूरे दो साल हो गए हैं, उसे संसद में न रखने का क्या कारण है?

तीसरे, क्या मंत्री महोदय को यह जानकारी है कि आडिट रिपोर्ट में 2 करोड़ 41 लाख रुपये की तो गड़बड़ी बताई गई है, इसके अतिरिक्त करोड़ों रुपए राइट आफ करने की शिकायतें की गई हैं। क्या माननीय मंत्री जी ने वह रिपोर्ट देखी है या देखने की कृपा करेंगे--

NAFED, in the interest of the producer and in the interest of the consumer.

श्री योगेन्द्र मकवाणा : श्रीमन्, यह बात सही है कि कोआपरेटिव संस्थाएं इसलिए बनाई गई हैं कि जिससे उपभोक्ता व उत्पादक दोनों को लाभ हो । जहां तक नेफेड का सवाल है, नेफेड ने जब कभी मार्केट में जाकर परचेज किया है, जैसे अभी अभी हमने कोपरा खरीदा है जब उसकी दाम काफी गिर गया था ।

'When the market prices are very low, NAFED is paying higher prices to the producers, the farmers. Therefore, there is bound to be loss and th$_e$ loss is appropriated between the State and the Central Government: They bear it fifty-fifty. But that is up to the tun$_e$ of only Rs. 2l lak'.ta only and the rest cf it NAFED has to meet from their own earnings. They ar$_e$ earning *bj* exporting certain commodities and they have not incurred any loss. I have the balance sheet and everything with me. I can say that the net profit during these live years is Rs. 3.43 crores. There was a loss in two years 1982-83 and 1933-84. But for the rest of the three years there has always been a profit. And. tne net profit is Ks. 603.16 lakhs. Against that, the losa is Rs. 250 lakhs. So, if we deduct it, the total j-mount -which comes as profit is Rs. 343.16 lakhs. So, there i$_s$ no question of the NAFED making loss.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : मैंने तो नहीं पूछा क्या लॉस है, क्या प्रोफिट है ।

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Then, the other thing that has been said is that the NAFED is employing agents. Agents are employed oaly because foreign parties ar$_e$ dealing with us as well as with private parties, and the private parties are directly supplying to the foreign buyers, but the NAFED j$_s$ charging their commission. And in some cases when the foreign buyer insists thi wants to purchase through such and such a man, then, he acts as an agent, otherwise not..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister you heve " answered the point. It may make an overall profit. But if there are any individual items of misappropriation, individual item$_s$ of loss writen off, then, you must explain why it was done. You cannot say that overall you have made the profit and that, therefore any misappropriation or any written-off item can be condoned or approved.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : मुझे आप इजाजत दें तो बहुत शोर्ट में एक दफा और रिपीट कर दूं । मेरा पहला प्रश्न यह है कि क्या मंत्री महोदय को यह जानकारी है कि कोआपरेटिव इंस्टीट्यूशंस के रूल्स के विपरीत नाफेड ब्रोकर्स, कांट्रेक्टर्स और कमीशन एजेंट्स के जरिये व्यापार कर रहा है? दूसरा यह है कि 1983-84

की एनुअल रिपोर्ट अभी तक भी पार्लियामेंट के सामने पेश नहीं की गई क्यों? दूसरा यह कि जहां तक इसकी आडिट रिपोर्ट का सवाल है क्या मंत्री महोदय ने देखी है? अगर नहीं देखी है तो क्या उसे खुद देखने की कृपा करेंगे इन द इंट्रैस्ट आफ द इंस्टीट्यूशन?

श्री बूटा सिंह : जैसा मेरे सहयोगी ने बताया कि नैफेड हो या कोई दूसरा सहकारिता का संगठन हो इनके व्यापार करने के दो पहलू हैं। एक व्यापार तो ग्रोअर्स से करते हैं उसमें अगर कोई कंट्रेक्टर्स या एजेंट हों तो उसकी आप शिकायत कर सकते हैं।

We have these co-operative societies. And for that matter any business organisation will have to depend . upon certain channels which are functioning in the private sector. Therefore, if it is an export exercise, ii... NAFED will have to take help of aU these organisations, while procurement is directly from the growers, which is the most essential part of the NAFED activities, that the growers must benefit from the co-opcrulive institution.

The second issue, why the report has not been placed, has been ex-lained by -my col'eague that '-htre have been certain queries. The Board is seized of' the matter. As soon as the Board clears the report, it will come to Government, and Governrnent will flrst study the report and then place it. before the House. There is no hesitation on the part of Government to place this report before tbe House.

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SUfGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, when a largje business house makes a loss, everybody says the business mani made a mistake or the Directors of the company made a mistake. When a large cooperative in the private sector or a large public sector enterprise makes a loss, it ig thought to he corruption. Thig is a fact. And ♦his problem has been compounded with the rise of investigative journalism. As far as I understand, the NAFED, the Directors of the NAFED, have not made a mistake according to the hon. Minister. If they have made no mistake, if the officers are not at fault, the Government ought to have taken an unequivocal stand and released all the material to the press and made a statement on the issue, making it very clear that this was a part of the business practice, that this had nothing to do with any corruption or anything of this sort. This ought to have been made clear, and it should still be made clear now, not a denial by the NAFED, but a clarification by the Minister and the Department.

Coming to the specific question, I would like to know from the hon. Minister this. Everybody keeps talking about loss and profit. I believe that the NAFED is involved in the payment of large amounts of subsidies in terms of support price for various agricultural items. I would like to know specifically from the hon. Minister what is the quantum of loss suffered by the NAFED on the payment of this support price for various items. If that amount had not been paid, what would have been the projected profit of NAFED?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The last supplementary does not arise out of this question, because it pertains to a particular year's Audit Report. If the hon. Member wants information on this let there be a separate question on the viability of NAFED and the support that is being given to the growers. We are prepared for it and we will come with a full answer. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: I am only supporting you, Mr. Minister.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा: मान्यवर, इस विषय पर आधे घंटे की इजाजत चाहता हूं। आप इस विषय पर आधे घंटे की चर्चा की इजाजत दीजिये। मैं इस पर बीसों क्वेश्चन पूछ सकता हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You write a letter. I will consider.

Demolition of Jhuggis in Delhi

*145. DR. MOHD. HASHIM KIDWAI: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state'

(a) what is the number of jhuggis and dhabas demolished in Delhi and New Delhi during the current year;

(b) what ls the number of Jhuggi dwellers and dhaba owners provided v;ith alternative accommodation and sites?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINTSTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) According to information received from DDA, MCD, NDMC, Delhi Cantonment Board, Ministry, of Defence, & Department of Railways 8088 jhuggis and 64 Dhabas have been demolished in Delhi and New Delhi during the current year. In addition DDA removed 840 other encroachments from its land but has not kept any separate figure of dhabas removed.

(b) Alternative accommodation has been provided by the DDA as follows:—

(ll) Allotment of accommodation to Jh-u|g£|i\~tThompri dwellers in transit camps—4185 Units.

(2) Allotment of commercial sites;—63.

DR. MOHD. HASHlM KIDWAI: My first Supplementary is this. Why did the DDA not keep tho figures of demolished Dhabas? Will the Minister instruct the DDA to keep figures of Dhabas demolished in future?

श्री दलबीर सिंह : महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने करन्ट ईयर में पिछले चार महीनों में जो डी०डी०ए० ने 6715 अवैध अतिक्रमण हटाये हैं उनके बारे में पूछा है । इनमें से 5875 झुग्गी-झोंपड़ी निवासी हैं और शेष जो 840 हैं वे फुटकर अतिक्रमण हैं, जैसे किसी ने चारदीवारी बना ली या खोखा बना लिया या डेरी बना ली । इस तरह के अतिक्रमण हैं । इन 5875 मामलों में 4185 परिवारों को डी०डी०ए० ने अपने ट्रांजिट कैम्पस के माध्यम से आलटरनेटिव आवास दे दिया है और जो बाकी रह गये हैं उनके पास वैध कागजात न होने की वजह से उनको ये सुविधाएं नहीं दी गई हैं ।

DR. MOHD. HASHIM KIDWAI: My first question has not been answered. The Minister had stated that the DDA removed 340 other encroachments from its land, but has not kept any separate figures of Dhabas removed. So, my question is why did the DDA not keep figures for the demolished Dhabas? This thing has not been answered.

My second Supplementary question i$_s$ this. How long will Jhuggi dwel-lerj be accommodated in transit camps and by what time will they provide them with alternative accommodation?

श्री दलबीर सिंह : श्रीमन्, इनमें से बहुत कम रह गये हैं । हम यह प्रयास कर रहे हैं कि जैसे ही हमारे पास ट्रांजिट कैम्पस होंगे, हम उनको देंगे । लेकिन जैसा कि मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि बाकी जो लोग बचे हैं, वे जो झुग्गी-झोंपड़ी वाले हैं उनके पास वैध कागज-पत्र नहीं थे, कोई वैध डाकुमेन्ट्स नहीं हैं । इस वजह से उनको बसाने में दिक्कत आ रही है ।

SHRI BHAGATRAM MANHAR While I welcome the Government's action in removing unauthorised constructions, we have to look at the problem from the humanitarian angle also. That is why I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether his Ministry wishes to assure the